

CHAPTER 6

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the public outreach and participation opportunities made available through the development of this RMPA/EIS and consultation and coordination efforts with tribes, government agencies, and other stakeholders. This chapter also lists the interdisciplinary team of staff who prepared the RMPA/EIS.

The BLM land use planning activities are conducted in accordance with requirements of the NEPA, CEQ regulations, and BLM policies and procedures implementing NEPA. The NEPA and associated laws, regulations, and policies require the BLM to seek public involvement early in and throughout the planning process to develop a reasonable range of alternatives to proposed actions and to prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. Public involvement and agency consultation and coordination, which have been at the heart of the planning process leading to this draft RMPA/EIS, were achieved through *Federal Register* notices, public and informal meetings, individual contacts, media releases, and the Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy project website (<http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/sagegrouse/western.html>).

6.2 COLLABORATION

Federal laws require the lead agency to consult with certain federal and state agencies and entities and Native American tribes (40 CFR Part 1502.25) during the NEPA decision-making process. Federal agencies are also directed to integrate NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements to reduce paperwork and delays (40 CFR Part 1500.4-5).

In addition to formal scoping (**Section 6.4.1**, Scoping Process), the BLM implemented an extensive collaborative outreach and public involvement process that has included coordinating with cooperating agencies, holding public

scoping meetings, and holding a socioeconomic workshop. The BLM will continue to meet with interested agencies and organizations throughout the planning process, as appropriate, and will continue coordinating closely with cooperating partners.

6.2.1 Native American Tribal Consultation

The BLM began tribal consultation by requesting a consultation meeting with area tribes to discuss the details of the GRSG planning efforts. Each of the tribes was also invited to participate in the planning effort as cooperating agencies. The list of tribes contacted is detailed in **Table 6-1**, Cooperating Agencies.

The draft RMPA/EIS will be provided to the tribes concurrently with its release to the public.

6.2.2 Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer Consultation

The draft RMPA/EIS will be provided to the Oregon State Historic Preservation Offices concurrently with its release to the public.

6.2.3 US Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation

To comply with Section 7(c) of the ESA, the BLM consulted USFWS early in the planning process. USFWS provided input on planning issues, data collection and review, and alternatives development in their role as a cooperating agency.

6.3 COOPERATING AGENCIES

A cooperating agency is any federal, state, or local government agency or Native American tribe that enters into a formal agreement with a lead federal agency to help develop an environmental analysis. More specifically, cooperating agencies “work with the BLM, sharing knowledge and resources, to achieve desired outcomes for public lands and communities within statutory and regulatory frameworks” (BLM 2005d).

On December 7, 2011, the BLM wrote to 35 local, state, federal, and tribal representatives, inviting them to participate as cooperating agencies for the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-region RMPA/EIS. There were 7 more follow-up letters to Native American tribes. Twelve agencies agreed to participate on the EIS as designated cooperating agencies, all of which have signed MOUs with the BLM (**Table 6-1**). Some agencies are participating as cooperating agencies under the larger umbrella of the national-level MOUs described below.

The Forest Service and USFWS are participating in the EIS process as cooperating agencies at a national level, and both agencies have signed MOUs at a national level.

**Table 6-1
Cooperating Agencies**

Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperators	Agencies that Accepted	Agencies that Signed MOUs
Counties		
Baker County		
Crook County	X	X
Deschutes County	X	X
Gillam County		
Grant County		
Harney County	X	X
Jefferson County		
Klamath County		
Lake County	X	X
Malheur County	X	X
Morrow County		
Sherman County		
Umatilla County		
Union County		
Wallowa County		
Wasco County		
State Agencies		
Governor's Natural Resources Office		
Oregon Department of Agriculture		
Oregon Department of Economic Development		
Oregon Department of Energy		
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality		
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	X	X
Oregon Department of Forestry		
Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries		
Oregon Department of Land Conservation/Development		
Oregon Department of Transportation		
Oregon Division of State Lands		
Oregon Water Science Center		
Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department		
Oregon State University	X	X
Federal Agencies		
Bureau of Reclamation		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	X	X
Federal Highway Administration		
Natural Resources Conservation Service	X	X
US Army Corps of Engineers		
US Attorney's Office		
USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service		
USDA Rural Development		
US Environmental Protection Agency		
US Fish and Wildlife Service	X	X

**Table 6-1
Cooperating Agencies**

Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperators	Agencies that Accepted	Agencies that Signed MOUs
US Forest Service	X	X
Tribes		
Burns Paiute Tribe		
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs		
Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma		
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation		
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall		
Fort McDermitt Paiute Tribe		
Nez Perce Tribe		
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley		
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation		
Fort Bidwell Indian Community		
Klamath Tribes		
Other		
Harney Soil and Water Conservation District	X	X

Since starting on May 18, 2012, the BLM has conducted 9 meetings to date with cooperating agencies. Cooperating agencies were also encouraged to attend the scoping open houses and provide comments during the scoping period (**Section 6.4.1**). These agencies have been engaged throughout the planning process, including during alternatives development.

6.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement is a vital and legal component of both the RMPA and EIS processes. Public involvement vests the public in the decision-making process and allows for full environmental disclosure. Guidance for implementing public involvement under NEPA is codified in 40 CFR Part 1506.6, thereby ensuring that federal agencies make a diligent effort to involve the public in the NEPA process. Section 202 of the FLPMA directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish procedures for public involvement during land use planning actions on BLM-administered lands. These procedures can be found in the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1 (BLM 2005d). Public involvement for the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-region RMPA/EIS includes the following:

- Public scoping before beginning NEPA analysis to determine the scope of issues and alternatives to be addressed in the RMPA/EIS
- Public outreach via newsletters and press releases throughout the RMPA/EIS process
- Collaboration with federal, state, local, and tribal governments, and cooperating agencies throughout the RMPA/EIS process

- Public review and comment on the draft RMPA/EIS
- Public review and comment on the final RMPA/EIS

6.4.1 Scoping Process

The formal public scoping process for the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-region RMPA/EIS began on December 9, 2011, with the publication of the notice of intent in the Federal Register (76 *Federal Register* 77008-77011). The notice of intent notified the public of the BLM's intent to prepare EISs and supplemental EISs to incorporate Greater Sage-Grouse conservation measures into LUPs; it also initiated the public scoping period. A notice of correction to the notice of intent was released on February 10, 2012 (77 *Federal Register* 7178-7179). The notice of correction extended the scoping period until March 23, 2012.

Project Website

The BLM launched a national Greater Sage-Grouse conservation website as part of its efforts to maintain and restore Greater Sage-Grouse habitat on public lands. The national website is available on the Internet at <http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/sagegrouse.html>. The BLM has also launched a Great Basin regional website: <http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/sagegrouse/western.html>. These sites are regularly updated to provide the public with the latest information about the planning process. The Great Basin website provides background information about the project, a public involvement timeline, maps of the planning areas, and copies of public information documents and notice of intent. The dates and locations of scoping open houses were also announced on the Great Basin website.

Press Release

A press release was made available on the national and Great Basin region websites on December 8, 2011, announcing the scoping period for the EIS process. The Oregon BLM State Offices also distributed a press release on January 10, 2012, announcing the scoping period for the EIS process. The press release provided information on the scoping open houses being held and described the various methods for submitting comments. A second press release was posted on the national and Great Basin websites on February 7, 2012, announcing the extension of the public scoping period to March 23, 2012. A third press release was issued on the national and Great Basin websites on February 9, 2012, announcing the addition of National Forests to the GRSG planning efforts (not applicable to Oregon).

Public Scoping Open House

The BLM hosted five open houses to provide the public with an opportunity to become involved, learn about the project and the planning process, meet the planning team members, and offer comments. The scoping meetings were held in an open house format to encourage participants to discuss concerns and questions with the BLM and other agency staff representatives. The location and date of the open houses were as follows:

- Lakeview, Oregon – January 17, 2012
- Ontario, Oregon – January 23, 2012
- Baker City, Oregon – January 24, 2012
- Burns, Oregon – January 25, 2012
- Prineville, Oregon – January 26, 2012

Scoping Comments Received

Detailed information about the comments received can be found in the *National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy Scoping Summary Report*, finalized in May 2012 (BLM 2012b). A total of 585 unique written submissions were received for the Great Basin region. Of these, 169 were specific to Oregon. The issues that were identified during public scoping and outreach are described in **Section 1.5.2, Issues Identified for Consideration in the Oregon Sub-Region Greater Sage-Grouse RMP Amendments**, of this RMPA/EIS. These issues guided the development of alternative management strategies outlined in **Chapter 2** of this RMPA/EIS.

6.4.2 Future Public Involvement

Public participation efforts will be ongoing throughout the remainder of the RMPA/EIS process. One substantial part of this effort is the opportunity for members of the public to comment on this draft RMPA/EIS during the comment period. The proposed RMPA/Final EIS will respond to all substantive comments received during the 90-day comment period. A Record of Decision will then be issued by the BLM after the release of the proposed RMPA/Final EIS, the Governor's Consistency Review, and any resolution of protests received on the proposed RMPA/Final EIS.

6.5 LIST OF PREPARERS

This RMPA/EIS was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of staff from the BLM and Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc. (EMPSi; see **Table 6-2, List of Preparers**). In addition, staff from numerous federal, state, and local agencies, and nonprofit organizations contributed to developing the RMPA/EIS.

The following is a list of people that prepared or contributed to the development of the RMPA/EIS.

Table 6-2
List of Preparers

Name	Role/Responsibility
BLM-Oregon State Office	
Oregon State Office	
Joan Suther	Project Manager
Jeanne DeBenedetti Keyes	GIS Specialist

**Table 6-2
List of Preparers**

Name	Role/Responsibility
Paul Fyfield	GIS Specialist
Tim Barnes	Core IDT Lead-Renewable Energy, Mineral Resources
Al Doelker	Core IDT Lead-Riparian and Wetlands, Fisheries and Aquatic Wildlife
Louisa Evers	Core IDT Lead-Air quality, climate change, Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species, Wildland Fire Management
Charlie Fifield	Core IDT Lead-Rangelands
Glenn Frederick	Core IDT Lead-Special Status Species, Big Game Species
Craig Goodall	Core IDT Lead-Wildland Fire Management
Bob Hopper	Core IDT Lead-Forest and Woodland, Wild Horse and Burros, Livestock Grazing
Janet Hutchinson	Core IDT Lead-Lands and Realty
Chris Knauf	Core IDT Lead-Recreation and Travel Management
Maggie Langlas Ward	Core IDT Lead-Special Designations, including Lands with Wilderness Characteristics; NEPA review
Stan McDonald	Core IDT Lead-Cultural Resources and Tribal Interests
Mark Mousseaux	Core IDT Lead-Special Status Plants, ACECs
Josh Sidon	Core IDT Lead-Social and Economic Conditions (Including Environmental Justice)
Dale Stewart	Core IDT Lead-Soil Resources, Water Resources
Steve Storo	Core IDT Lead-Mineral Resources
EMPSi: Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.	
David Batts	Program Manager
Derek Holmgren	Project Manager and Project Support-Soils and Water Resources
Amy Cordle	Project Support-Climate Change
Angie Adams	Project Support-Special Designations and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
Annie Daly	Project Support-Special Designations and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
Carol-Anne Garrison	Project Support-Cultural Resources and Tribal Interests
Zoe Ghali	Project Support-Livestock Grazing and Wild Horses and Burros
Peter Gower	Project Support-Lands and Realty
Brandon Jensen	Project Support-Fish and Wildlife
Katie Patterson	Project Support-Mineral Resources
Holly Prohaska	Project Support-Livestock Grazing and Wild Horses and Burros
Jenifer Thies	Project Support-Wildland Fire Management
Drew Vankat	Project Support-Recreation and Trails and Travel Management
Jennifer Whittaker	Project Support-Minerals
Liza Wozniak	Project Support-GRSG
Meredith Zaccherio	Project Support-Vegetation
Marcia Rickey	GIS Specialist
Jenna Jonker	GIS Specialist

Table 6-2
List of Preparers

Name	Role/Responsibility
Jordan Tucker	GIS Specialist and Project Support-Soils and Water Resources
Kate Krebs	Special Designations and Project Support
Randolph Varney	Technical Editor
Laura Long	Technical Editor
Cindy Schad	Word Processor
ICF International Team	
Rob Fetter	Project Manager – Socioeconomics
Alex Uriarte	Project Assistance
Roy Allen	Project Assistance